

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

AMINA JOHNSON,

Case No. 2:24-cv-02033-APG-EJY

Plaintiff,

V.

GENERAL DYNAMICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY,

Defendant.

ORDER

10 The Court has before it Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Review with Compassionate
11 Consideration (ECF No. 81). After a careful review of the Motion, it remains unclear what Plaintiff
12 is seeking and, therefore, whether the Court has the authority to grant relief. Plaintiff initiated this
13 action after exhausting her administrative remedies as required before naming General Dynamics as
14 a defendant; the case is proceeding through litigation; Plaintiff was recently granted leave to file her
15 Second Amended Complaint; and Plaintiff has been provided clarification of the deposition process.
16 There are no motions seeking to dismiss Plaintiff's claims pending; nor is there a motion for
17 summary judgment on file. A review of the docket shows there is nothing awaiting judicial review.

18 Although Plaintiff is *pro se*, which allows the Court to review her filings and pleadings less
19 stringently than represented parties, *see Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), Plaintiff must
20 still follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and this District's Local Rules. *Ghazali v. Moran*,
21 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995) (internal citation omitted). The Court cannot provide relief based on
22 Plaintiff's instant motion.¹ Plaintiff may wish to review Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil
23 Procedure and any guidance she may find regarding motions made under this Rule.

26 ¹ The Court notes Plaintiff discusses the Virginia office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
27 However, it is unclear what relief Plaintiff seeks or the Court could grant. Plaintiff received her right to sue letter from
28 the EEOC allowing her to proceed with the instant matter. “[F]ederal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, and ... a
right-to-sue notice from the EEOC is needed before ... [a] suit can proceed in federal court.” *Jeffrey v. Cornell
Corrections*, Case No. C 02-01424 WHA, 2002 WL 1058343, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2002). As is true with all cases,
once in federal court a plaintiff must prove a defendant acted in violation of the law.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Review with
2 Compassionate Consideration (ECF No. 81) is DENIED without prejudice.

3 Dated this 1st day of August, 2025.

4 
5 Elayna J. Youchah
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28